UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,902	11/24/2003	Alan L. Billings	930034-2041	5301
	7590 12/30/200 AWRENCE & HAUG	8	EXAMINER	
745 FIFTH AV	ENUE- 10TH FL.		AFTERGUT, JEFF H	
NEW YORK, N	NY 10151		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1791	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/720,902	BILLINGS ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Jeff H. Aftergut	1791	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>04 December 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, wwith 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07()	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	n. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of thortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the second conte	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw); ter form for appeal by materially rec	ΓE below); ducing or simplifying tl	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	See Continuation Sheet.		ŕ
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-6,8 and 16-23. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 7 and 9-15. AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☑ wil rided below or appended.	l be entered and an e.	xplanation of
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).
10.	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 		condition for allowan	ce because:
12.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Jeff H. Aftergut/ Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1791		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06) Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The rejection under 35 USC 102 over Wicker as well as the rejection under 35 USC 103 over Welch in view of Wicker.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The rejection of claims under 35 USC 102 over Wicker as well as the rejection under 35 USC 103 over Welch in view of Wicker has been withdrawn in light of applicant's response. However, the rejection over Billings in view of Hansen and McGahern as well as the double patenting rejection over these references remains. It should be noted that Billings clearly taught the provision of a polymeric coating on the base fabric. The coating was provided on the base fabric by needling the base fabric with a nonwoven fiber layer to provide a layer from the fibers 64 which were needled into the base layer 52. The entire structure (including the layer 64 and base 52) was impregnated with a curable polymer material thus forming layer 64 of fibers and resin on the outside surface of the belt assembly. It should be noted as previously addressed that it would have been obvious to one of orindary skill in the art to form grooves in this exterior layer 64 on the base structure 52 in light of the references to Hansen and McGahern et al. impregnation of the base structure which included the needling of the layer of fibers 60 forming surface layer 64 would have resulted in a liquid polymer resin coating applied and cured on the outside surface of the base structure 52. Application of grooves within the polymeric layer 64 would have been obvious in light of the prior art of record. No claims are allowed.